



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,957	12/09/2003	Richard C. Ferri	AUS920030843US1	3686
45971 7590 11/28/2007 IBM CORPORATION (RUS) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201				
EXAMINER				
MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/28/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,957

Applicant(s)

FERRI ET AL.

Examiner

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 09/12/2007.
2. Claims 1-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 25, and 38-39 have been amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 10-13, 16-17, 21-28, 34-37, 40-41 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bolnick et al. ("Bolnick", US 6,043,817).

As per claim 1, Bolnick teaches a method for automatically organizing a plurality of icons on a computer desktop (col.7, lines 28-33; col.12, lines 25-55) comprising:

using a computer, performing the following series of steps:

displaying a graphical user interface having a define segments menu and a submit control (col.17, lines 3-19; *selection of a menu item is equivalent to submission control*);

responsive to a user selecting a segment location, a segment size, an icon group, a icon organization at the define segments menu (col.18, lines 30-51), and activating the submit control (col.19, lines 7-11; *selection and storing of modified menu items is equivalent to submission control*),

creating a segment on the desktop (col.17, lines 12-19);

defining the segment size in relation to the desktop (col.19, lines 26-56);

classifying the plurality of icons into the icon group (col.16, lines 11-55);
placing the icon group into the segment (col.16, lines 11-55, col.21, lines 38-49); and
organizing the icons within the segment in accordance with the icon organization (col.9, lines 44-48; col.21, lines 38-49);

wherein the only user actions required to automatically organize the plurality of icons on the computer desktop are for a user to make a plurality of user selections at the define segments menu and to activate the submit control (col.21, lines 38-49).

As per claim 2, Bolnick teaches the method further comprising:
analyzing the icons to determine the icons' attributes and using the icons' attributes to classify the icons (col.16, lines 11-55).

As per claim 3, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the icons' attributes are a type of application associated with each of the icons (col.16, lines 28-38).

As per claim 4, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the organization of the icons is to shrink the icons down to the icons' smallest possible size (col.31, lines 28-40).

As per claim 10, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the segment is user defined (col.19, lines 26-56).

As per claim 11, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the icon group is a group of webpages (col.8, lines 27-30).

As per claim 12, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the icon group is a group of games (col.8, lines 27-30).

As per claim 13, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the icon group is a group of development tools (col.8, lines 27-30).

Claims 16-17 and 40-41 are individually similar in scope to claims 3-4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25-28 are similar in scope to claims 1-4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21-24, 34-37, and 45-48 are individually similar in scope to claims 10-13 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-7, 18-20, 29-31, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolnick et al. ("Bolnick", US 6,043,817) in view of Scott et al. ("Scott", US 6,545,687).

As per claim 5, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the organization of the icons is to change the size of the icons (Bolnick, col.31, lines 28-40). However, Bolnick does not teach the method such that the icons fill the segment. Scott teaches a method of organizing a plurality of icons such that the size of the icons are changed to fill the segment (Scott, col.16, lines 17-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Scott's teaching with Bolnick's method in order to make use of all available space.

As per claim 6, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the organization of the icons is to change the size of the icons (Bolnick, col.31, lines 28-40). However, Bolnick does not teach the

of claim wherein the organization of the icons is to place the icons in the segment at normal size, but if the icons do not fit into the segment at normal size, then to shrink the size of the icons until the icons fit into the segment. Scott teaches a method of organizing a plurality of icons such that the size of the icons are shrunk to fit the icons into the segment (Scott, col.16, lines 17-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Scott's teaching with Bolnick's method in order to be able to view all of the icons at once.

As per claim 7, Bolnick teaches the method wherein the organization of the icons is to change the size of the icons (Bolnick, col.31, lines 28-40). However, Bolnick does not teach the method wherein the organization of the icons is to place the icons in the segment at normal size, but if the icons do not fit into the segment at normal size, then to add a scroll bar within the segment. Scott teaches a method of organizing a plurality of icons such that a scroll bar is added when the icons do not fit within the segment (Scott, col.1, lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Scott's teaching with Bolnick's method in order to be able to view all of the icons at normal size.

Claims 18-20, 29-31, and 42-44 are individually similar in scope to claims 5-7 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 8-9, 14-15, 32-33, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolnick et al. ("Bolnick", US 6,043,817) in view of Nason et al. ("Nason", US 6,717,596).

As per claim 8, Bolnick teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the segment is defined by steps comprising:

defining a segment location (Bolnick, col.10, lines 40-43);

defining a segment size (Bolnick, col.10, lines 40-43);

defining the icon group associated with the segment (Bolnick, col.6, lines 45-47; col.8, lines 26-67); and

defining the icons organization within the segment (Bolnick, col.6, lines 45-47; col.9, lines 44-48).

However, Bolnick does not teach the step of defining whether the segment covers the wallpaper on the desktop. Nason teaches a method of organizing segments on a desktop wherein segments are defined to be located outside the border of the desktop (Nason, col.6, lines 19-21; col.26, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Nason's teaching with Bolnick's method in order to be able to view numerous segments at once.

As per claim 9, Bolnick teaches defining segments within a desktop (Bolnick, col.10, lines 40-43). However, Bolnick does not teach the method of claim 1 wherein the segment does not cover the wallpaper on the desktop. Nason teaches a method of organizing segments on a desktop wherein segments do not cover the desktop (Nason, col.6, lines 19-21; col.26, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Nason's teaching with Bolnick's method in order to be able to view numerous segments at once.

Claims 14 and 38 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 2 and 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15, 32, 39 are individually similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 9/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued Bolnick's method is complicated and requires many steps whereas applicant's invention provides for organizing icons on a desktop by only making selections from a menu and activating a submit control therefore requiring fewer user actions.

The Examiner disagrees because Bolnick teaches the invention as claimed wherein the only user actions required to automatically organize the plurality of icons on the computer desktop are for a user to make a plurality of user selections at the define segments menu and to activate the submit control (col.21, lines 38-49, *selection of a menu item is equivalent to submission control*). Applicant's invention claims making a plurality of selections as taught by Bolnick.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2174

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4065. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sy D Luu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

/S. M./